

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Communication of October 28, 2004, held the Amendment filed September 2, 2004 non-compliant. That Communication checked a box indicating that each must claim must be provided with the proper status identifier, and also checked a box indicating that "claims 13-29 and 31-41 text should not be underlined if they are previously presented".

In response to that Communication, applicants believe the Amendment filed September 2, 2004 was proper.


First, all claims submitted in that Amendment are believed to have a status identifier.

Further, with respect to claims 13-29 and 31-49, those claims are new claims relative to the original patent, and thus are believed to be properly underlined. As noted in M.P.E.P. § 1453, amendments in a reissue application are to be made vis-à-vis the original patent and not in comparison to a prior amendment. As claims 13-29 and 31-49 are new claims relative to the original patent, it is believed to be proper to underline those claims.

Applicants now request proper consideration of the Amendment filed September 2, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of record

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)